DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 296 990 SP 030 426

AUTHOR Kuhs, Therese M.; Cook, Nancy R.
TITLE The Teacher Cadet Program in Progress. A Study of the 1987-88 Implementation.
INSTITUTION South Carolina Univ., Columbia. South Carolina Educational Policy Center.
PUB DATE Jun 88
NOTE 60p.; For related document, see SP 030 427.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College School Cooperation; *Curriculum Evaluation; High Schools; High School Students; *Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; *Program Implementation; Secondary Education; Student Characteristics; *Student Recruitment; *Teacher Education Programs; Teacher Selection
IDENTIFIERS South Carolina; *Teacher Cadet Program

ABSTRACT

The South Carolina Teacher Cadet Program (TCP) was developed to recruit high school students with strong academic records into the field of teaching. The program enrolls such students in a senior honors class to learn more about teaching, learning, schools, and the field of education. The program is established in 54 sites in the state and invites the cooperation of "partner" colleges, which, in some cases, offer college credits for participating students. This document reports the results of surveys assessing the program's effectiveness that were sent to all TCP teachers, to the principals of schools where TCP is offered, and to representatives of the partner colleges and universities. The surveys investigated the selection of TCP teachers, recruitment of students, involvement of partner colleges, and local perceptions of the value of both the TCP curriculum guide and the cadet program itself. (JD)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED296990

THE SOUTH CAROLINA EDUCATIONAL POLICY CENTER
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA

# The Teacher Cadet Program in Progress
## A Study of the 1987-88 Implementation

by

Therese M. Kuhs

Nancy R. Cook

June, 1988

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

T. M. Kuhs

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

SP 030426

THE SOUTH CAROLINA EDUCATIONAL POLICY CENTER
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA

# The Teacher Cadet Program in Progress
## A Study of the 1987-88 Implementation

by

Therese M. Kuhs

Nancy R. Cook

June, 1988

# THE TEACHER CADET PROGRAM IN PROGRESS

Much that has been written about American schools paints a bleak picture. Perhaps nothing is more discouraging than reports that fewer talented individuals are entering the field of teaching because broader career options have opened, especially for women and minorities (Astin, Green & Korn, 1987; Darling-Hammond, 1984). A report to the U.S. Department of Education (Applied Systems Institute, 1984) revealed a trend that portends poor quality in the teacher workforce of the future: "...in 1973, education majors' verbal SAT score were 6.1% below the national average and fell to 8.2% below the national average by 1981."

The South Carolina Teacher Cadet Program (TCP) represents an innovative approach to counteract this trend by recruiting high school students who have strong academic records into the field of teaching. The program invites such students to enroll in a senior honors class to learn more about teaching, learning, schools, and the field of education. But the Teacher Cadet Program is not merely a course of study; the program is a representation of what teaching and teachers will be like in the American schools of the future. Cadets who eventually decide to pursue a career in teaching make the career decision with a keen awareness of what it takes to be an effective teacher and a strong commitment to become one.

In the fall of 1987, the South Carolina Center for Teacher Recruitment (SCCTR) asked the South Carolina Educational Policy

Center (SCEPC) of the University of South Carolina to conduct a two phase assessment of the Cadet Program. Phase I assessed the initial impact of the TCP using surveys and interviews with college freshmen who had been in the 1986-87 TCP classes (see Berry, Kuhs, Ginsberg, & Cook, 1988). Phase II assessed program implementation and identified the basic characteristics of the Cadet Program in fifty-four 1987-88 sites. In addition, special efforts were made in the study to discover how the TCP program varies from site to site, and to evaluate the newly developed curriculum guide, "Experiencing Education" (Bowers, Black, & Ward, 1987). The results of the second phase study are reported herein.

For the second phase of the evaluation study surveys (see Appendix) were sent to all TCP teachers, to principals of schools where TCP is offered, and to representatives of the partner colleges or universities. The surveys were designed to investigate particular program characteristics such as the selection of TCP teachers, recruitment of students, involvement of college partners, and local perceptions of the value of both the TCP curriculum guide and the Cadet Program itself.

This report is based on responses to surveys returned by 41 TCP teachers, 44 high school principals, one school administrator who oversees the program at three schools, and 17 faculty members from 14 different colleges. The primary data for the Phase 1 study were also used (i.e., 160 surveys and 39 interviews of 1986-87 Cadets and the surveys of 274 high school

Cadets and 434 non-cadets in the 1986-87 high school sites).

Genesis of the Cadet Program

The TCP can trace its origins to a program initially offered at Conway High School in Horry County in 1974. In the 1985-86 school year a "Cadet Teacher" program was piloted in four South Carolina high schools as a strategy to combat a growing teacher shortage. The number of sites and students has continually expanded involving 28 high schools in 1986-87 and 54 schools in 1987-88. SCCTR has received notification from the administration of an additional 24 schools planning to begin offering TCP classes in the fall of 1988.

The South Carolina Center for Teacher Recruitment (SCCTR) coordinates the Teacher Cadet Program at the state level. The coordination effort involves a wide range of activities. First, the Center has been instrumental in identifying instructional materials and in developing the curriculum guide for TCP classes. They offer orientation sessions for teachers who are new to the program and inservice meetings for teachers and college representatives. SCCTR facilitates communication among TCP sites through a newsletter, "The Cadet Net" and employs experienced TCP teachers to serve as consultants who visit TCP teachers and classes throughout the state. Finally, the coordination effort involves offering special opportunities to the students in the program. For example, student competitions are sponsored by SCCTR and each year the Center has held a "Professional Conference" attended by students from

Cadet sites throughout the state.

In most cases, the local TCP program is associated with an institution of higher education, called the "college partner." The type and amount of involvement by the college partners vary from site to site. For example, the opportunity to earn college credit for the Cadet Program class is offered in some, but not all sites. In some high schools, a college faculty member conducts the TCP class sessions on a regular basis, while in others, college faculty involvement is only on a "visiting speaker" basis. Since the local high school designs the course schedule, in some sites the course is a one semester offering, while in others, TCP is a full-year course.

The Local Cadet Programs

According to the teachers responding to our surveys, the majority of TCP classes (62%) are taught in the morning for, on the average, 50 minutes. In many sites the morning scheduling is important because it simplifies arrangements when Cadets are to observe or work with teachers in other buildings. The class size varies dramatically, from 8 to 28 students, with the mean class size of 15 students. The principals of 35 sites reported that TCP was offered as a full-year course, while 4 offered the course for the fall semester only, 3 for the spring semester only, and 3 sites offer the one-semester TCP class both semesters.

The SCCTR records report that eighteen colleges were "partnered" with TCP sites in 1987-89. Table 1 displays the

names of the colleges with their high school partners and reveals the state distribution of TCP sites. Twenty-nine high school sites were partnered with one of the 13 colleges or universities that offer college credit for the TCP class. The number of credits earned at each site varies and is reported in the third column. Sixteen high schools were each partnered with one of the five colleges or universities that did not offer college credit. Five high schools did not have a college partner but some of these contracted with a college professor for assistance in setting up the TCP class during the first year it was offered.

Based on the survey responses from 45 high school administrators we learned that in 17 sites, all TCP students earn college credit while in 4 sites, a student can elect to earn college credit or not. Financial responsibility for these college hours is borne by the students (5 sites); the school district (3 sites); shared between the student and the district (3 sites); or paid by other sources (3 sites). One TCP teacher reported that the other teachers in her district had established a scholarship fund to pay the college credit fee for those who need financial assistance.

Table 1

Table of College/High School Partnerships

| COLLEGE | HIGH SCHOOLS | CREDIT OFFERING |
|---|---|---|
| Baptist College | North Charleston<br>Wando | 3 hours |
| Benedict College | Eau Claire | No credit |
| The Citadel | Burke<br>Lincoln<br>Middleton<br>Summerville | 3 hours |
| Coker College | Cheraw<br>Chesterfield<br>Hartsville<br>St. Johns (Darlington) | No credit |
| College of Charleston | Baptist Hill<br>James Island<br>St. Andrews<br>St. Johns (Charleston) | 3 hours |
| Columbia College | Richland N.E. | 3 hours |
| Converse College | Spartanburg | No credit |
| Francis Marion | Mullins<br>Wilson<br>South Florence<br>West Florence | No credit |
| Furman University | Eastside<br>Greenville<br>Travelers Rest | 3 hours |
| Lander College | Greenwood | 2 hours |
| Newberry College | Mid-Carolina | 1 hour |
| South Carolina State College | Orangeburg-Wilkinson | 2 hours |
| USC - Aiken | Aiken<br>Midland Valley<br>North Augusta<br>South Aiken<br>Strom Thurmond | 3 hours |

Table 1 (continued)

| COLLEGE | HIGH SCHOOLS | CREDIT OFFERING |
|---|---|---|
| USC - Coastal | Conway<br>Kingstree<br>Socastee<br>Sumter Academic Center (Furman, Hillcrest & Mayewood) | 3 hours |
| USC - Columbia | Chapin<br>Dreher<br>Irmo<br>Keenan<br>Lexington<br>Lower Richland | No credit |
| USC - Salkehatchie | Barnwell<br>Walterboro | 3 hours |
| USC - Spartanburg | Dorman | 3 hours |
| Winthrop College | Northwestern<br>Rock Hill | 3 hours |
| No college partner | Battery Creek<br>Beaufort<br>Goose Creek<br>Stratford<br>Sumter | No credit |

Deciding to be a Cadet

High ability high school seniors typically choose course electives from a wide variety of options that are available. The success of TCP depends on talented students' selecting the Cadet class rather than some other elective. In order to understand the dynamic of success that TCP enjoys and to insure the extension of that success in new TCP sites, it is important to consider why students decide to become Cadets.

The wide variety of methods used to recruit students into the Cadet class were revealed in interviews of 1986-87 Cadets. One student recalled that the 13 members of her class received a letter that they would be "guinea pigs" and would receive privileges as Cadets, such as off-campus lunch passes. Another student recalled that the top 20 people in the junior class were called in for a meeting with the teacher, the guidance counselor and the principal. He recalled:

> It was a new class and they wanted us to take it to see how it would work out for the school. It sounded pretty interesting so my friends and I decided to take it. My calculus teacher was going to teach it and that influenced us, too.

We asked a group of non-TCP teachers at TCP sites why they thought students took the Cadet class. The most common reason they proposed was that the student is interested in learning about the teaching profession. However the teachers also suggested other reasons such as college credit, the reputation of the course, "easy" AP credit, or the popularity of the TCP teacher. Several teachers described the honor attached to

being invited as a real plus for recruitment.

The availability of college credit itself does not apparently result in higher student participation in TCP. The mean class size in credit-offering sites was 15.57 students, while the mean enrollment was 14.3 at non-credit sites. Our teacher respondents were asked whether they felt that offering college credit could (or would) act as an incentive for recruiting students to the TCP. Fifty-five percent of our 39 teachers agreed that the college credit did encourage enrollment in the TCP. However, 71% of those describing college credit as an incentive are in schools where college credit is available, and only 26% of the teachers in schools where college credit is not offered felt that college credit would provide an incentive to enroll in TCP.

The question of college credit as an incentive was also explored in the Phase I survey of college freshmen who were Cadets in 1986-87. We asked two open-ended questions: "Why did you take the TCP?" and "What would you say to someone thinking about taking the TCP?" College credit was only mentioned by eight of the 160 Cadet respondents as a reason for taking the course while "learning about teaching," the most frequently cited reason, was mentioned by 68 individuals. None of our respondents mentioned college credit in response to our question about advice to an underclassman who asks about taking the Cadet course.

The comments of the 17 college respondents were divided on

whether credit-giving functions as an incentive to recruit students into the TCP class. Only seven felt that credit serves as an incentive while seven others felt that it does not. The remaining three did not respond to the question about this issue.

The suggestion that Cadets are recruited because of the honor associated with being invited to take the class reveals that students' decisions are influenced by the processes used to select prospective Cadets. Our surveys of college representatives, school administrators, and TCP teachers asked for an evaluation of the selection methods. On our 5 point scale, principals rated these methods as good to excellent (mean=4.30; standard deviation =.67). Teachers were slightly less positive in their evaluation, averaging 4.10 (standard deviation=.76). Only 13 of the 17 college respondents evaluated student selection methods, perhaps because they are unfamiliar with the school's approach to student selection. There was considerable variability in the college responses (standard deviation= 1.375) and the mean score was slightly above average (3.769).

The importance of the TCP teacher in attracting students to the class was revealed in all of our inquiries. Interviews with graduates of the Cadet experience revealed that, in some schools, the popularity and reputation of the TCP teacher was reason enough to take the course. One student commented,

> "I took the Cadet class after [the TCP] teacher recommended it as a great opportunity. She was one of

> my favorite teachers and I said okay... In class, she didn't tell us what to do based on "what we did last year." We all worked together. She listened and learned along with us.

It is this type of teacher that Cadets repeatedly mentioned in their discussions about the program. The teacher's enthusiasm and willingness to work with students were mentioned as reasons to enroll in TCP. Many students reported that they saw the TCP class as an opportunity to be taught by a teacher they admired and respected.

TCP Teachers

Despite their importance to the success of the program, there is no "typical" TCP teacher in terms of other courses they teach and the type of teacher certification they hold. Many TCP teachers teach in the humanities and social sciences (33% in English and 26% in history/social sciences). Some teach other subjects such as science (8%) and math (8%), or teach subjects such as music, art or home economics. As would be expected, TCP teachers are typically certified in the subject areas they teach, i.e., English, history, science and/or mathematics. Of the 39 teachers responding to our survey, 19 are teaching the TCP course for the first time; 17 report two TCP teaching experiences (including the current year); and three are three-time veterans.

TCP teachers are usually chosen by the school principal (78%). On our surveys, we asked principals, teachers, and college partners to evaluate the method used to select TCP teachers. On the average, principals rated these methods as

good to excellent on our 5 point scale (mean=4.40; standard deviation=.96). Teachers were equally positive in their evaluation (mean=4.43; standard deviation=.66). Only eleven of the college partners responded to this item, but they too gave favorable ratings (mean= 4.091; standard deviation= 1.375).

TCP teachers are chosen for a variety of reasons. Yet, the importance of the TCP teacher being an outstanding teacher was repeatedly emphasized in principals' responses to the survey. As one principal wrote, "Having the 'right' teacher is a key to the success of the program." Ninety percent of our principals mentioned that, in their schools, teachers are selected for the TCP assignment because they have the reputation of being an "outstanding teacher." In fact, being outstanding as a teacher was cited by principals as being "the most important" criterion for TCP teacher selection (60%). At the same time many principals reported assigning teachers to TCP because they volunteered to teach the class.

One principal's remarks identify a number of factors that may influence the success of TCP in a school.

> As a retiring principal, I feel compelled to comment that the selection of an experienced, outstanding teacher is crucial to the success of the program. Then, total support of that teacher should be extended to him/her by the principal. This support is easily given when the county endorsement is made known. Here at [our] high school the TCP is a magnificent opportunity for students to be introduced to the field of education. [the college partner's] leadership and [teacher's name] have served to facilitate the implementation of what I consider to be an important and outstanding program at my school.

Local Sites and Support Services

Part of our surveys focused on some of the policy and support issues described by the principal as crucial to the program's success. We asked both principals and teachers whether the college partners, the SCCTR, local administration, and other teachers in the district provide the support and cooperation necessary for the success of the Cadet Program. The mean responses to each item by principals and teachers are reported in Table 2.

For the most part, both principals' and teachers' responses suggest that logistical support and cooperation is no problem for the local Cadet programs, (i.e., means range from good to excellent, "4" or "5" on our 5 point scale). Typically, principals are slightly more positive in their evaluation of these factors than are the teachers. Interestingly, one exception to this pattern is associated with the assistance of the SCCTR; teachers evaluated the services of the Center more favorably than principals did, although both indicated that it was good to excellent.

Comments written on the survey response form provide insight into the importance of assistance and the cooperation of the SCCTR, of local school personnel, and of college partners. One teacher wrote, "The support that I have received throughout the year has been good. I got notice that I would teach the class the week before school started. In spite of this, I received ample support to get things done."

Table 2

Mean Responses for Principals and Teachers
Items concerning TCP Delivery/Support Systems

| | Principals (n=45) | | Teachers (n=39) | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Mean | SD | Mean | SD |
| Assistance from SCCTR | 4.23 | 1.11 | 4.82 | .45 |
| Scheduling field experiences | 4.18 | .69 | 4.10 | .94 |
| Availability of readings, instructional supplies, etc. | 4.12 | .69 | 3.92 | .84 |
| Guest speaker presentations | 4.29 | .90 | 4.28 | .76 |
| Dependability of college/ university staff | 4.21 | 1.17 | 3.68 | 1.45 |
| Effectiveness of sessions by college/university staff | 4.05 | 1.00 | 3.68 | 1.18 |
| Logistical support provided by college/university staff | 3.98 | 1.32 | 3.54 | 1.37 |
| Cooperation of building administrator (teachers only) | | | 4.64 | .67 |
| Attitudes of teachers (colleagues) toward TCP | 4.43 | .59 | 4.18 | .79 |
| Cooperation of high school teachers (with observations) | 4.67 | .52 | 4.44 | .82 |
| Cooperation of teachers in other schools with observations | 4.68 | .47 | 4.64 | .54 |
| Cooperation of administrators in other schools where students were involved | 4.73 | .45 | 4.69 | .52 |
| Cooperation of district office (principals only) | 4.61 | .85 | | |

Scale: 5=excellent; 4=good; 3= average; 2=needs improvement; 1=poor

Another teacher commented about the support she got from her colleagues, and others as well, saying,

> The [local high school] faculty is very supportive of the student selection process of the Teacher Cadet Program. They put a lot of time into their recommendations for students to become Cadets. And the SCCTR staff is wonderful! They are knowledgeable, efficient, complimentary and supportive.

A principal described a problem confronted at their school when the TCP teacher was absent for an extended period of time. The principal was concerned that a substitute teacher, who would be unfamiliar with the program, could not conduct the class sessions or direct the various activities. When made aware of the situation, the Teacher Recruitment Center helped with arrangements and teaching so that the TCP class could continue its work despite the teacher's absence.

The breadth of support offered to TCP teachers was apparent in the list of guest speakers the teachers reported using. Some invited staff from the SCCTR, members of the press, and representatives from professional organizations such as the South Carolina Education Association and the Palmetto State Teachers Association. Other teachers asked mothers with small children, professionals from children's service agencies (e.g., social workers dealing with child abuse) and health care professionals (e.g., pediatricians) to speak to the Cadets about critical events in the lives of children. At some sites, teachers were able to get state legislators, various people from school district central office (including the superintendent), other teachers, college faculty members and

even former Cadets to talk to the class.

Several suggestions for improving the delivery/support systems were given by teachers and administrators. The teachers requested more instructional support materials, particularly films. Many praised the quality of movies about teachers that were available (e.g., "Conrack") and then requested that more be identified and made available to them. Another teacher suggested more correspondence from the SCCTR or perhaps more frequent publication of the "Cadet Net" newsletter.

The survey of college partners also requested ratings of logistical support systems at the TCP sites. Their responses expressed some concern over the scheduling of field experiences for the Cadets. As one faculty member commented, "It is difficult to find a time in the schedule where these students can get to another school, observe, and then return for their next period class." Indeed, the scheduling and difficulties related to transporting students to field experience sites probably constrain the amount and diversity of field work that can be planned. Yet, interviews and surveys of graduates of the Cadet experience suggest that this dimension of the TCP experience is the most important recruiting tool in the program. In fact, some who had thought of becoming secondary school teachers decided to seek certification at the elementary school level as a result of working in classrooms there.

College Partners

Although teachers' mean ratings of support services were positive, the relatively high standard deviations for questions related to the college partnerships indicate high evaluations by some respondents and low evaluations by others. For example, we found that although 41% assessed the dependability of the college staff as excellent ("5" on our 5 point scale), twenty-five percent of the teachers responded to this item with ratings of "1" or "2" (below average on the scale). Teachers' ratings of the effectiveness of sessions done by college partners were similarly variable with 31% indicating excellence ("5") and 18% indicating poor quality ("1" or "2"). Continuing the pattern, 33% of the teachers feel logistical support from college partners is excellent and 24% feel it is below average. The difficulties are, indeed, site specific. Only six of the 18 participating college partners were evaluated negatively by one or more teacher respondents, and three of these partners were criticized by three or more different teachers. At the same time, all except two of the college partners received positive evaluations from two or more teacher respondents.

The theme of limited support and involvement by college partners was obvious in comments of teachers at sites where low ratings were given to the partners. One complained, "My partner has helped very little -- she calls once a month to tell me I'm doing a good job." The negative comments about the college

partnership are often directed at an individual rather than at the institutional arrangements. For example, one teacher wrote, "Our college partner has done minimal to date. I asked several other members of the college to speak and they did an excellent job." Another teacher explained that the first year of the program the college partnership was excellent but that the next year a problem was caused by a different individual at the college.

Although the exact nature of the difficulty with college partnership at particular sites may vary, inconsistent responses to our questions from teachers working with the same college partner suggest that one problem is a misunderstanding about the roles and responsibilities of the college partner. One teacher wrote,

> I am not pleased with the college person assigned to us this year...We were assigned a consultant and not a professor....As a result, I may ask my principal not to offer college credit or find another TCP teacher. The only support we got from the college was to send an admission officer to us in order to register students.

Yet, another teacher partnered with the same college rated the college support as excellent for all items.

Several college representatives recognize the difficulty with partnership arrangements. They mentioned their frustration over the lack of clarity concerning their contribution to the TCP, and discussed need for more support from their colleges. For example, they felt that their campus work loads should be adjusted to provide adequate time for their TCP duties. Specifically, they discussed the need for

time to meet and work with the local TCP teachers.

The college partnerships that work well seem to take advantage of the opportunity of having college faculty and high school teachers collaborate in planning and offering the TCP experience to students. College partnerships that don't work well seem to be characterized by confusion about what the faculty member should do, what the college should provide in the way of support to the TCP, and what is the exclusive responsibility of the high school teacher.

The Curriculum

The curriculum guide, "Experiencing Education," first used by TCP teachers in 1987-88, is presented in three thematic sections. The first section, focusing on the learner, contains six units of study. The section on the study of the school contains four units, while the section on the teacher and teaching contains two units.

Special effort was made in this research to evaluate the curriculum guide. Questions were included in the surveys of TCP teachers and college partners. These questions were designed to elicit information for the review and revision of the curriculum guide, and to determine how much similarity there is in the classes across the state. We asked both teachers and college partners to rate each unit with respect to three defined characteristics: quality, usefulness, and appropriateness, using a five-point scale ranging from excellent (5), to not at all (1). Our definition of each

characteristic appeared on the survey form itself (see Appendix for survey form and table of results).

Realizing that in places where college credit is given, the college partner might be required to follow the college syllabus rather than the TCP guide, we asked our college representatives how carefully they had reviewed the guide. They were asked to characterize their review of the guide as cursory, substantive or extensive. Five respondents described their review as cursory, eight as substantive, and three as extensive. Since several of the college representatives had not reviewed the units and few had close contact with the class when the units were taught, we decided that comparison of college partners' ratings to teachers' was inappropriate. Overall, college partners rated the units as good to excellent on our 5 point scale. However, they consistently rated one unit, "Reporting on Our Roots" below the other units in the curriculum guide.

The curriculum has been generally well received by teachers also. Of 39 teacher respondents, 27 reported that they used 50% or more of the curriculum, and only six reported using 25% or less of the material. One teacher wrote,

> I think that the curriculum guide is a wonderful resource. The amount of material included makes it possible for a teacher to choose material appropriate for his/her students. Of course, the strength of the TC program lies in the sharing of successful experiences by the TC teachers. As the program expands, we will continue to get better.

This teachers's comment highlights one of the special

features of the TCP Curriculum; it is not "cast in stone." Teachers can make adaptations without destroying the spirit of the program. One teacher explained that she had developed her own TCP approach based on previous classes and used the guide in an "a la carte" manner. Another teacher described her use of the guide writing, "I think that the curriculum guide is a wonderful resource. The amount of material included makes it possible for a teacher to choose material appropriate for his/her students."

Teachers can also capitalize on local resources and facilities. For example, some teachers do not need parts of the guide because their school is located in an area where it is easy to find a wide variety of speakers who can conduct sessions on topics in the curriculum. However, in another school, a teacher may not be able to arrange as many visiting speakers and the detailed suggestions from the guide become an important resource.

Cadets benefit from the freedom TCP teachers have to adapt and modify the curriculum. One college respondent praised the curriculum unit entitled, "Reporting on Our Roots," describing a project where the local TCP teacher designed a unique way to study the content outlined in the unit. The Cadets in that class produced a video biography of a prominent black educator of their area. This was the same unit that was criticized by college partners at other sites.

As was mentioned earlier, many respondents mentioned that

having a high quality TCP teacher is important to the success of the program because Cadets come to see their teacher as a model of what the profession is like. Allowing the Cadets to witness this excellent teacher dealing with the challenge of teaching TCP and having the freedom to plan experiences that "fit" may well be the aspect of the program that makes the recruitment of bright and talented Cadets possible. As was said earlier, TCP is not merely a course of study, it is a model of what teaching and teachers in the future will be like.

The teachers' responses contained several suggestions to improve the TCP curriculum based on their first year's experience with the guide. Some of these identified the need for instructional materials or resources, especially nonprint media. The request for a "student booklet" of readings was common. Although the teachers' guide contains a wide range of appropriate readings, some teachers were unable to use these materials because the cost of duplicating was prohibitive. Other teachers requested that the guide should include a list of contemporary issues for class discussion and suggestions for types of speakers that might be used.

Teachers found that certain instructional activities (e.g., games and simulations) worked well with the Cadets. They suggested the inclusion of more activities of this type and commented that certain units were "light on activities."

Other comments by teachers referred to the content of the curriculum. Many commented that the quality of the units is

variable. They suggested inclusion of more information on teacher evaluation, particularly information about the state observation instrument for beginning teachers, Assessment of Performance in Teaching (South Carolina Department of Education, 1983). Others felt that more information about the Program for Effective Teaching (PET) would be useful (South Carolina Department of Education, 1984). Many respondents recommended placing less concentration on human growth and development and more on the psychology of learning, especially if the program is to recruit teachers for middle and high school levels.

A brief description of each unit, identifying the instructional objective from the curriculum guide and the teachers' evaluations, is presented in the next section. Our survey, also asked teachers to estimate the numbers of days that were spent on each unit. Of the 29 teachers who completed this part of the survey, four taught classes that only last one semester. The descriptions of time allocation reported below refer to the full-year course sites unless described otherwise.

Using "Experiencing Education"

Section I, Unit 1 : Know Thyself

This introductory unit seeks to acquaint TCP students with themselves as individuals, as learners and as members of a community. The objective is to have each Cadet describe five personal experiences that exemplify their strengths. The unit

offers nine activities. Some are designed to encourage participants to see themselves as others see them, others provide background on the work of theorists who have influenced the field of education. For example, some of the activities involve consideration of Gregorc's (1985) work on learning styles, and Hogan and Champagne's portrayal of personality styles (1979).

The mean ratings of quality (4.6), usefulness (4.6), and appropriateness (4.54) of material in the unit are consistently positive. In schools where TCP is a full semester course, teachers' reports of days spent on this unit vary from 3 to 25 days, and 50% of the teachers spent 10 or more days on the unit. In one-semester sites two teachers spent 5 days, one spent one day, and one teacher did not report the number of days spent on this unit.

Section I, Unit 2 : "Full Pot" - The Role of Self-Esteem

In this unit, students become familiar with the work of William Purkey (1970, 1984) and learn to appreciate the role of self-esteem in personal and child development. The unit uses children's literature to teach about this important affective variable. One activity provides Cadets with an initial "teacher-like" experience by having them plan and present a puppet show for a group of younger children.

Again, teacher reports reveal considerable variation in the amount of time spent on the activities within the unit (0 to 25 days in full-year classes; 3 to 6 in semester sites). Ratings

of the quality, usefulness, and appropriateness were high (above 4.5). The puppet show activity seems to have worked particularly well in many sites. Teachers praise the activity because it was a wonderful way to develop understanding of self-concept and it was a clever way to get some Cadets over the "stage-fright" they might experience when trying to teach a group of children.

Section I, Unit 3 : Discovering the World - The Learner from Birth Through Five Years"

In this unit, the students are to become familiar with theories about physical, intellectual, linguistic, and social development of children from birth to age five. The curriculum guide provides a number of readings and introduces Cadets to the work of theorists such as Jean Piaget (Bybee & Sund, 1982) and Erik Erikson (1963). In addition to class discussions and readings, the guide suggests other activities. One proposes that Cadets have a chance to observe children, perhaps in a hospital nursery, in a preschool, or by having mothers bring children to the TCP class. Another activity involves simulations to help Cadets recognize the value and purpose of play. The culminating unit activity suggests that Cadets design a "model child care program" for young children.

The number of days teachers reported spending on this unit again varies dramatically. Some reported spending no time on this unit, while the time spent by those who taught the unit ranged from 3 to 30 days. The ratings of quality (4.16),

usefulness (3.88), and appropriateness (3.91) are also more variable with the means being somewhat lower than earlier units. The lower mean scores probably reflect teacher concerns related to the unit's overemphasis on "babies" and the lack of focus on older preschool children. One teacher noted that her students "seemed to lose interest" during the unit.

Section I, Unit 4 : Making Sense of the World - The Learner from Six through Ten Years

In this section, the student continues with the study of child development by studying the intellectual, linguistic and social development of elementary school students (ages 6-10). A number of background readings are included in the guide. One activity focuses in particular on the concern expressed by David Elkind in The Hurried Child (1981). Observation of classes in elementary schools are also proposed and the guide includes observation report forms to help structure the Cadets' experience. The final objective of this unit is a student produced parent guide, "Helping Your Child Succeed in Elementary School."

The number of days teachers allocated to this unit again varies widely from 0 to 27 days. The teachers' assessments are positive on the 5-point scale (i.e., quality, 4.07; usefulness, 3.93; appropriateness, 4.00) but are not as high as they were for the first two units. One teacher clarified her "3" rating of appropriateness telling us that, "...most of my students were interested in middle school and high school levels."

However, another teacher stated that her students really enjoyed the unit because of their interest in the age group. Several teachers commented that their classes got "bogged down" in this and the following units on the learner.

Section I, Unit 5 : Barriers to Learning - What Inhibits Learning

In this unit, students explore the needs of special students who sometimes confront a range of "barriers to learning." In particular, the unit provides information about students who are learning disabled, physically or emotionally handicapped, or gifted and talented. Consideration of social issues, such as the latchkey child phenomena and child abuse and neglect, are also discussed as potential barriers to learning. Unit activities include simulations to help Cadets develop sensitivity to the needs and feelings of such children. The guide suggests that Cadets produce a book for either primary (K-2) or intermediate grade (3-5) students to address barriers to learning.

Every teacher who completed this part of the survey reported spending time on this unit. Again variation in time allocation is wide in the full-year sites with one teacher spending only 3 days, while another spent 30 days. Teacher assessments of this unit were high (greater than 4.3 in each category). The importance of this unit was also substantiated by teachers' written remarks. For example, one teacher commented on the benefits of touring a facility for the profoundly handicapped.

However, several teachers felt that the unit contained too many readings and too few suggestions of activities that called for student involvement.

Section I, Unit 6 : Confusion about the World - Adolescence

This final unit in the study of learners continues the themes found in the previous units, discussing intellectual, linguistic and social development in children from 11 to 18 years of age. The unit emphasizes the changes children experience during the middle school years and the consequences of these changes in terms of behavior, both in school and out of school. Since the unit focuses on the Cadets' own age group, experiences had to be planned to encourage Cadets to reflect with some degree of objectivity on the examples and situations discussed. The activities call for examination of adolescent fiction as well as nonfiction to gain insight into this period. As a final product, the TCP students write case studies of students in this age group, based on the themes in the literature they read.

Although teachers still spend varying amounts of class time on this unit, with few exceptions, they report spending less time on the unit than they did on most of the others. Teachers' estimates of days spent in this unit ranged from 1 to 20 days with a mean of 7. The mean assessment ratings are also comparatively low on the 5 point scale (quality, 3.85; usefulness, 3.89; appropriateness, 3.92). Further, the standard deviations demonstrate greater variability in the

ratings than those of previous units. Teachers comments reflect the difference of opinions about the unit. One teacher wrote, "I was very disappointed with this section. We need more material on secondary education." In contrast, another teacher called the unit "super...the handbook and questions were excellent."

Section II, Unit 1 : What is a school?

This is the first unit of the second strand in "Experiencing Education." The goal of this unit is to help students develop an appreciation for and knowledge of what schools mean to the variety of people they serve. In this unit, students learn about characteristics of schools that are more effective than others. The cooperative learning strategy known as "Jigsaw" (Slavin, 1978) is used to allow students to explore schools and schooling from different perspectives. Students have opportunities to read about the findings of recent research on school and classroom effectiveness.

The length of time for this unit was less variable than the previous units although the range of days was from 2 to 20. The mean number of days spent was 8.31 with a standard deviation of 5.2. The average assessments given by the teachers was also good (i.e., all greater than 4.3). However, several teachers again mentioned time issues in commenting on the unit saying the class got "bogged down."

Section III, Unit 2 : Who runs this place?

This second unit on the school, is designed to help Cadets continue to develop their appreciation for and knowledge of schools and the people that they serve. In this unit, the students examine the roles of various staff members in schools. They learn strategies of interviewing and "shadowing" (observing) to gather information about the various tasks and responsibilities of school professionals and other employees. As the end result, the students present characterizations of members of the school staff.

Teachers report not spending as much time on this unit, with a range of 2 to 15 days. Importantly, 11 of the 38 teachers did not respond to the time question with several indicating that they had not "gotten to it yet." The assessment of quality (4.33), usefulness (4.30), and appropriateness (4.37) remained in the good to excellent range. In particular, they praised the quality of instructional materials and activities associated with this unit.

Section II, Unit 3 : Reporting on Our Roots

Understanding schools in the past is necessary to understand schools of the present. This unit seeks to provide the historical context of schools in South Carolina. In this unit, the major activity is writing and presenting a radio program concerning a past era in South Carolina schools.

Seventeen of our 38 teachers did not give a number of days

for this unit. Some indicated that although they had not yet actually taught the unit, they had allocated a given number of days to it in their planning. The mean days given (including these estimates) was 4.45 days. Many teachers did not respond to items concerning the evaluation of the unit. The assessments of those who did respond were positive. Unfortunately, many teachers reported omitting this unit because they just "ran out of time."

Section II, Unit 4 : Seeing Both Sides

In this unit, the complex issues currently affecting the public schools are the focus. Students are expected to research and present an argument in a debate related to topics they select. Twenty of our 38 teacher respondents did not indicate time spent on this unit. The time allocations that were reported included estimates of the time that they planned to spend on this unit (a range of 3 to 15 days). Fifty-three percent of the teachers did not respond to the items rating the unit, probably because they had not taught the unit yet. The mean ratings from those who did respond were all each greater than 3.8.

Section III, Unit 1 : The Teacher

This unit is the first of two in the third strand of "Experiencing Education." It is designed to teach the students about teachers, professionally and personally. A variety of instructional methods are suggested to achieve this objective.

The guide recommends films and videotapes about teachers, conversations with outstanding teachers about their careers, an examination of demographic characteristics of teachers as a group, and a study of the teacher certification process.

Again, it is difficult to interpret the numerical ratings and the report of time allocation because so many teachers (32%) did not respond. One teacher wrote,

> The curriculum was great but I didn't have sufficient time to spend on "School" and "Teacher and Teaching" (Sections II and III). I believe too much time is given to human growth and development.

Teachers reported using from 3 to 45 days on this unit. The assessments again were in the good to excellent range.

Section III, Unit 2 : The Process of Teaching

The second unit in the strand, "The Process of Teaching," seeks to give the students appreciation for the comprehensive nature of teaching as an art and a science. This unit includes activities related to Cadets' own learning experiences in school, to the Program for Effective Teaching (PET) that is being used in South Carolina, and to classroom factors that have positive and negative effects on students' learning (South Carolina Department of Education, 1984). Within this unit, students have "teaching experiences" in classrooms. They are asked to share their experiences with each other and reflect on their meanings.

The number of days was widely variable with a range from 5 to 45 days spent in the activities of the unit. The larger

number of days probably reflects variable amounts of time spent in actual classrooms, observing and serving as teacher's aid. Again, although 32% of the teachers did not respond, mean assessments of quality, usefulness, and appropriateness were high (above 4.5). Teachers reported numerous positive experiences that the students were having in elementary and middle schools. Not surprisingly, at the time of administering the survey, teachers were "just getting to the unit," and thus could not assess students' reactions to the field experiences.

Trials and Tribulations of Curriculum Implementation

The unit by unit description reveals that time was a problem that affected the curriculum as a whole. Teachers felt that deciding how to pace the units was somewhat difficult because the curriculum incorporated so many alternatives in the early units, and they had no basis for making decisions about how much to use. One teacher wrote,

> For the coming year, I will have a better idea of how to time the units to best advantage. My greatest complaint is that there is so much material one gets bogged down in it, and it is almost impossible to cut without destroying the effectiveness.

The time utilization issue was investigated, in part, in the survey when we asked teachers to give the approximate number of days the TCP class spent on a variety of field-based experiences. There were three types of experiences in this group, namely introduction experiences, observations, and teaching assistance. The curriculum guide proposed two

introductory experiences, preparing and presenting a puppet show for young children and touring the local school district office.

We asked teachers of full-year TCP programs (n=34) to estimate the number of days that their students spent on each of these field-based activities. The teachers' reports of days spent varied dramatically. Considering the puppet show, 21 of the 34 teachers reported spending at least one day, yet one teacher reported that her class spent 15 days on the activity. Twenty classes visited their local school district office with 16 reporting one class day being used for this activity and four reporting two days.

The curriculum guide also suggests a number of activities that involve observation of children of various ages in various settings (i.e., preschool, elementary school, middle school, high school, and special education facilities). Table 3 displays the number of TCP classes that spent specified numbers of days observing different levels. On the average, students spent 17 days observing classes. Elementary schools were visited by 32 of the 34 classes. Twenty-eight of these also visited preschool settings. Special education facilities or classes were observed by 30 classes, while middle school observations were conducted by 29 of the 34 TCP classes. Only 21 of the TCP classes completed a high school classroom observation assignment.

Next, we asked teacher to report the numbers of days

students assisted with instruction (e.g., worked as a teacher's aide, at the various levels). Table 4 reports the number of days individual teachers reported students assisted at the four levels. Cadets in 23 of the 34 full-year sites assisted with classroom instruction at the elementary level, while in 14 schools, students assisted in preschool. Fourteen teachers reported that Cadets assisted in special education settings. Cadets in 17 schools assisted with students in middle school grades. Only 13 TCP teachers reported that members of their class assisted with instruction of high school students, perhaps because many feel that Cadets cannot comfortably assume the role of teacher's assistant in a peer setting.

Examining the teachers' reports of time allocation suggests that Cadets spend an unbelievably large number of days in field-based settings. However, the numbers are misleading in that teachers often allow individual students to choose a level at which they would work with a teacher for an extended period of time. These teachers recorded the number of days allocated to this activity for every school level category because different students choose different levels. Thus the total number of field experience days does not tell how many different days Cadets were in field settings. Specifically, of the 34 teachers, 13 mentioned that individual students would spend a particular number of days in a classroom at their chosen level.

Table 3

TCP Sites Reporting Number of Student Observation Days
(By School Level)

| Number of Days | 0 | 1-5 | 6-10 | 11-15 | 16+ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| TCP Sites (By School Level) | | | | | |
| Preschool | 6 | 27 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Elementary | 2 | 23 | 6 | 2 | 2 |
| Middle | 5 | 24 | 4 | 1 | |
| High School | 13 | 19 | 1 | 1 | |
| Special Ed. | 4 | 29 | 1 | | |

Table 4
TCP Sites Reporting Number of Student Field Experience Days
(By School Level)

| Number of Days | 0 | 1-5 | 6-10 | 11-15 | 16+ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| TCP Sites (By School Level) | | | | | |
| Preschool | 20 | 8 | 3 | 1 | 3 |
| Elementary | 9 | 5 | 8 | 2 | 8 |
| Middle | 17 | 6 | 4 | 2 | 5 |
| High School | 21 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 3 |
| Special Ed. | 20 | 7 | 4 | 1 | 2 |

The curriculum guide does not specify the particular career issues that Cadet groups might discuss. To gain insight into what topics teachers may have addressed concerning career decisions, the teacher survey included a list of career issues and topics that the 1986-87 Cadets had reported they studied in their TCP experiences. Table 5 lists these topics and the number of teachers of full-year programs that indicated that they covered these in class. As can be seen from this table, the focus in most TCP classes is on the positive aspects of teaching as a career, as well as information concerning the process by which one becomes a teacher. Little attention is paid to other professions, except for salaries, presumably to give Cadets a realistic idea of what other professionals earn.

Perceptions of the Cadet Program

In the course of the Phase I and Phase II studies we have had opportunities to survey and/or interview individuals whose comments represent a number of different perspectives on the TCP. The following discussion provides a report of the judgments, criticisms, and praise that different people offered in their comments about the program.

Views from Higher Education

The Cadet Program calls for a collaborative arrangement between college professors and high school teachers. Several college partners were associated with more than one high school site and thus were able to discuss the TCP classes based on information about more than one school or group of Cadets.

Table 5

Career Issues and Topics Discussed in TCP classes

| Issue | Number of Times Mentioned |
|---|---|
| Teacher salaries | 34 |
| Salaries in other professions | 28 |
| Teacher certification requirements | 32 |
| Qualifications for other professions | 13 |
| Responsibilities of teachers | 34 |
| Benefits of being a teacher | 33 |
| Advancement opportunities for teachers | 31 |
| Job market supply and demand for teachers | 33 |
| Job market supply and demand for other professions | 13 |

Regardless of whether or not students receive college credit at a high school, TCP is often described as a college-level class. We asked our college respondents to compare the TCP at their local sites to a "typical" freshman college course on the basis of four factors (i.e., the content of the course, the degree of initiative and/or responsibility of the students, the academic challenge of the course and grade assignment). These ratings were extremely variable although, on the average, the respondents indicated that the TCP was neither above the standards of this hypothetical college course nor below those standards. On our 5 point scale ("5" representing above the standard and "1" below), the mean for course content was 3.188 with a standard deviation of .911; the mean for the students' initiative and responsibility was 3.625 with a standard deviation of 1.025; and the mean for the academic challenge of TCP was 3.250 with a standard deviation of .856.

The college respondents commented that grading standards are below the level of freshmen courses. One respondent supported this view saying that at her site, all the Cadets received "A's" and she couldn't think of any freshman course in her institution where that was the case. This perceived "grade inflation" may be inaccurate, however, considering that, compared to the typical college class composed of students of varying academic ability and achievement, the Cadets are an elite group. They may well be the students who will earn the "A's" in mixed ability college classes.

The college partner's view about the purpose and function of TCP is also implied by the institution's position on whether or not college credit is awarded, and how the credit is accepted if the student goes into a teacher education program. An administrator at an institution that does not give college credit explained that granting credit would constrain the college's flexibility in working with the TCP sites because content and course requirements would have to be consistent with campus classes. Typically, when credit is earned, the colleges accept it only as elective study in degree programs. In other words, the TCP class does not replace a required course in a student's program of study. Two of the colleges that do not give college credit do allow TCP students to exempt a particular requirement from their college program of study because of the TCP experience.

Views from Non-TCP Teachers

Teachers in many of the levels of schooling in TCP districts are involved in the program in a number of ways, and thus are in the position to form opinions about the program. The high school teachers' views are especially important since they assist in the identification of students who will be invited to become Cadets. Further, students who are trying to decide whether or not to take the TCP course may seek advice from other teachers in their school. Also, teachers throughout the district must agree to have students in their classrooms for field experiences.

TCP teachers consistently describe the other teacher in their district as supportive and helpful. Within our Phase I study we asked teachers of high achieving non-cadet students to distribute surveys to their students. The student data provided a comparison group to assess effects of the TCP experience (see Berry, et al., 1988). We also asked those teachers, most of whom were not TCP teachers, to respond to open ended questions about their perceptions of the cadet program. They were asked such things as why they think students do or do not become Cadets, and what they think students learn in TCP classes. The responses from 23 non-TCP teachers provides a sampling of other teachers' views about the program.

Only one of the 23 teachers expressed strong criticism of the TCP concept. That teacher wrote,

> ...offering the teacher cadet class is unfair. If the school (and the state) offers and gives credit for a course familiarizing students with the teaching profession, then it should also offer and give credit for courses familiarizing students with the engineering profession, the medical profession, ... etc. Not to do so is unfair.

The responses of most other teachers praised both the program and the teachers who were involved. Some commented that they were "skeptical at first" but had become advocates for the program once they observed the experience it offered students. Some of the teachers' comments may indicate ambivalence, or perhaps resentment about the program. For example, two teachers' responses to questions about the program seemed

generally positive, but when asked why they thought students took the class, they said because it was "easy credit." One teacher, who said that he would not encourage students to become teachers because the salary and status expectations are low, responded to the question about what was taught in the class saying, "Half-baked ideas that have little or no relationship to the actual world of teaching." Such negative views are frequently revealed in studies of job-satisfaction in education, and this teacher's remarks probably have little to do with the essence of the Cadet program.

Views from the Principals' Office

Our survey of principals contained two items that provide insight into their feelings about the Teacher Cadet Program. One item asked whether they would recommend that other principals implement the program in their schools. Forty-four of the 45 principals responded "yes." The principal who did not say "yes" to the question responded "maybe" and explained, "I do not think that the students taking the course are taking it for the same reasons that the program is intended." Another principal said he would recommend the program but commented that the program has been costly for his school because of the way the offering has been designed locally. He wrote,

> The TCP Model is excellent but costly; 12 students maximum and an additional planning period for the teacher. We may not be able to continue the program because of fiscal restraints.

Principals were also given a list of reasons the TCP might be viewed as an asset. They were asked to indicate which

reasons on the list were ones that they felt applied to the program at their school. Forty-two of the 45 principals felt that it is an effective tool to recruit future teachers. Thirty-two principals indicated that TCP results in good public relations for the school and that it is an excellent class for bright students. According to 24 principals, the program is an asset because parents like the program.

The principals' positive responses to the program might be characterized by a comment written by one principal,

> We have had great success with the TCP....About 50% of the students are now considering education as a job in their future. Yet only one or two even thought about education as a career before they entered the course. We need these TCP students to at least consider education as a career choice.

Summary

The South Carolina Teacher Cadet Program has a considerable record of success in its first years. The prospect of expanding the program to new sites holds promise for those districts that have difficulty recruiting certified teachers for their schools. Of course, the final report card on TCP will arrive when students from the first Cadet groups enter classrooms as teachers, or go on to other careers.

Those who believe in the Cadet Program face the challenge of trying to sustain the best of the TCP. What we have learned about the strengths and weaknesses in the implementation of the program statewide is summarized below. We hope that our findings and recommendations help those who are involved this important effort to recruit talent to the field of teaching.

## Conclusions

1. Based on our inquiries we concluded that there are a number of reasons why a student decides to become a Cadet. College credit is one reason some students enroll, but it seems that the honor associated with being invited may, of itself, be a compelling reason for taking the TCP offering. Nonetheless, the reputation of the course and of its teacher clearly influences many student decisions about TCP.

2. The personality, enthusiasm, and commitment of the TCP teacher is probably the most dramatic factor influencing the success of the local programs. The effective TCP teachers do not hold teacher certification in any particular area. They might be teachers of mathematics or social studies, of music or English. The school principal typically selects the teacher who will teach TCP classes, but the selection is based on a variety of reasons.

3. For the most part, TCP teachers receive a great deal of support and cooperation from their colleagues, their administration, the SCCTR, and their college partners. They also find that community members and professionals in many child and education related fields are anxious to support the TCP class by offering their time, expertise, and facilities.

4. The college partnerships that work well seem to take advantage of the opportunity of having college faculty and high school teachers collaborate in planning and offering the TCP experience to students. College partnerships that don't work well seem to be characterized by confusion about what the faculty member should do, what the college should provide in the way of support to the TCP, and what is the exclusive responsibility of the high school teacher.

5. One of the strengths of the curriculum guide is its adaptability. Teachers at different sites structure the course to suit the local students, resources, staff, schedule, and their own expertise.

6. According to Cadets, the field experience component of the program has a powerful influence on their decisions about if they want to be a teacher and at which level they would like to teach. The Cadet classes may be more successful at recruiting teachers for lower grade levels than for others because of the emphasis of study, observation, and field-based experiences with younger children.

7. Teachers and the college representatives consider the quality of the units of the curriculum guide to be variable. Some units cover a narrow scope of content and some provide only a limited number of alternative activities, while others are so full and elaborate the teachers report getting "bogged down."

8. Although the large number of alternative activities in the curriculum guide provided flexibility, it was difficult for teachers to make judgments about how much time to allocate to each unit. As a result, some teachers spent a great deal of time on early units and could not adequately treat the units on the schools and teaching.

9. The Teacher Cadet Program is perceived positively by just about everybody. Non-cadet teachers and Cadet teacher alike, school administrators, college partners, and the Cadets themselves all praise the quality of the program both as a recruitment strategy and as an academic experience.

## Recommendations

1. The review of the curriculum guide should be directed to respond to deficiencies noted by the teachers. These are:

    a. nonprint instructional resources should be identified and made available through SCCTR or one of the other state agencies (e.g., ITV).

    b. A student text or a book of readings should be selected or written for the TCP classes.

    c. Game and simulation activities should be designed for inclusion in the units that teachers identified as being weaker than others.

    d. The section on The Teacher and Teaching should be expanded to include topics suggested by TCP teachers, (e.g., teacher evaluation strategies).

    e. The guide should provide activities that encourage the discussion of current events that are related to education in the local community, state and the nation.

2. Teachers should be given suggestions to guide the pacing of the various units of study in the course. Alternative time allocation charts might be designed for both the one-semester and the full-year courses.

3. Teachers of Cadet classes should be encouraged and supported in their efforts to provide field-based experiences in the critical-need teaching areas. Some school placements that are convenient may not be effective in recruiting Cadets into critical need teaching areas. Cadets might be sent to a high school other than their own for field-experiences at the secondary level to mediate the complications of being a teaching assistant in their own school.

4. High school/college partnership arrangements should be continued and encouraged, but the members in the partnership must be committed to investing time in collaborative planning. SCCTR should sponsor specific sessions where the various approaches to collaboration are shared with those involved in partnerships.

5. Local Teacher Cadet Programs should remain autonomous. Attempts to standardize such things as course requirements, teacher qualifications, and instructional materials should be avoided to insure that the local recruitment effort is consistent with the population of students it addresses.

## References

Applied Systems Institute. (1984) Tomorrow's teachers. Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office.

Astin, A., Green, W., & Korn, C. (1988). American freshmen: Twenty year trends. Los Angeles, CA: University of California at Los Angeles.

Berry, B., Kuhs, T.M., Ginsberg, R. and Cook, N.R. (1988) Recruiting talent to teaching: An assessment of the impact of the South Carolina Teacher Cadet Program. Columbia, SC: South Carolina Educational Policy Center.

Bybee, R.W. & Sund, R.B. (1982). Piaget for educators. Columbus, OH: Merrill.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1984). Beyond the commission report: the coming crisis in teaching. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation.

Elkind, D. (1981). The hurried child: Growing up too fast. Redding, MA: Addison Wesley.

Erikson, E. (1963). Childhood and society. New York, NY: W.W. Norton.

Gregorc, A. F. (1985). The Gregorc style delineator. Maynard, MA: Gabriel Systems.

Hogan, R. C. & Champagne, D. W. (1979). Personal style inventory. In Supervisory and management skills: a competency based training program for middle managers of educational systems.

Johns Hopkins University. (1981). Student team learning: Teacher's manual. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University.

Purkey, W. (1984). Inviting school sucess: a self concept approach to teaching and learning. Belmont, CA: Wadworth.

Purkey, W. (1970). Self-concept and school achievement. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall

South Carolina Department of Education. (1983). Assessment of Performance in Teaching. Columbia, SC: SC Department of Education.

South Carolina Department of Education. (1984). Program for effective teaching. Columbia, SC: SC Department of Education.

APPENDIX

Table A-1
Teachers' Ratings of Units

Professional Staff Survey
(TCP Teachers)

Principals' Survey

University Liason Survey

Table A-1
Means and Standard deviations
Teachers' Ratings of Units in "Experiencing Education" (N=39)

| Name of Unit | Quality | | Usefulness | | Appropriateness | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Mean | SD | Mean | SD | Mean | SD |
| Know Thyself | 4.60 | .70 | 4.60 | .60 | 4.54 | .74 |
| Full Pot | 4.61 | .66 | 4.58 | .62 | 4.58 | .71 |
| "Discovering the world | 4.16 | .88 | 3.88 | .81 | 3.91 | .86 |
| Making Sense of the World | 4.07 | .83 | 3.93 | .91 | 4.00 | .74 |
| Barriers to Learning | 4.30 | .77 | 4.39 | .70 | 4.42 | .71 |
| Confusion about the World | 3.85 | 1.26 | 3.89 | 1.25 | 3.92 | 1.26 |
| What is a school? | 4.31 | .84 | 4.35 | .85 | 4.42 | .76 |
| Who runs this place? | 4.33 | .73 | 4.30 | .78 | 4.37 | .79 |
| Reporting on our roots | 4.33 | .73 | 4.30 | .80 | 4.30 | .80 |
| Seeing both sides | 4.00 | 1.28 | 3.89 | 1.23 | 4.11 | 1.28 |
| The Teacher | 4.30 | .77 | 4.39 | .70 | 4.42 | .71 |
| The Process of Teaching | 4.50 | .70 | 4.54 | .71 | 4.69 | .54 |

**TEACHER CADET PROGRAM**
**PROFESSIONAL STAFF SURVEY**

**Part I: Program Information**

1. Name of School: _____

2. At your school, the Teacher Cadet Class is offered as (check one):

   ( ) a full year course
   ( ) a one semester course (fall only)
   ( ) a one semester course (spring only)
   ( ) a one semester course (both semesters)

3. Give the time of day the class meets. _____ to _____

4. In your class students (check one):

   ( ) do not have an opportunity to earn college credit
   ( ) all earn college credit
   ( ) may choose to take the class for college credit or not

5. If college credit is available, the fee is paid by:

   ( ) the student
   ( ) the school district
   ( ) shared between student and district
   ( ) other
   ( ) not applicable

6. In your school, would/does the availability of college credit for the Cadet class encourage students to enroll?

   ( ) Yes ( ) No

7. How many students were in your TCP class this year? (If you had two classes, give enrollment for each.) _____

8. To the best of your knowledge, approximately how many students from your TCP class had expressed an interest in becoming a teacher *PRIOR* to taking the course? _____

9. To the best of your knowledge, approximately how many students from your TCP class have expressed an interest in becoming teachers *SINCE* taking the course? _____

10. Name the college or university that is your college partner. _____

11. Including this school year (and any previous years), how many TCP classes have you taught? _____

12. What other courses do you teach during semesters when you teach the Cadet class?_____

    _____

13. What South Carolina certifications or endorsements do you hold? _____

Use the back of the page as necessary to complete any responses.

**Part II: Delivery/Support Systems**

For each item below, circle the numbers to indicate your evaluation: (5) Excellent; (4) Good; (3) Average; (2) Needs Improvement; (1) Poor; (0) Don't Know.

| | | Excellent | | | | Poor | DK |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 14. | Our school's method of recruiting students to the Teacher Cadet Program. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 15. | Our school's method of selecting teachers to present the Teacher Cadet Program. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 16. | Assistance received from the Teacher Recruitment Center. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 17. | Ability to schedule field experiences during our class meeting time. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 18. | Availability of reading materials, instructional supplies, non-print media. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 19. | Presentations by guest speakers. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 20. | Dependability of the college/university staff. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 21. | Effectiveness of sessions presented by the college/university staff. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 22. | Logistical support provided by the college/university staff . | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 23. | Cooperation of your building administrator. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 24. | Attitudes of your colleagues toward the Teacher Cadet Program. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 25. | Cooperation of teachers in *YOUR* high school when students observed and/or conducted activities. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 26. | Cooperation of teachers in *OTHER* buildings where students observed and/or conducted activities. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 27. | Cooperation of administrators in other buildings with which your students were involved. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |

Comments:

**Part III: TCP Curriculum, "Experiencing Education"**

28. Check to indicate approximately how much of the curriculum, "Experiencing Education," you use?

( ) 0-10% ( ) 10-25% ( ) 25-50% ( ) 50-75% ( ) 75-100%

29. Approximately how many <u>total days</u> were your students involved in the following field experiences? (If the activity was not used, write 0.)

**Introduction activities**
_____giving a puppet show
_____touring the central office

**Gathering information through observations in**
_____ preschool
_____ elementary school
_____ middle school
_____ high school
_____ special education

**Assisting instruction in**
_____ preschool
_____ elementary school classrooms
_____ middle school classrooms
_____ high school classrooms
_____ special education

30. Which of the following would increase your use of the "Experiencing Education" curriculum materials? (check all that apply)

( ) more time to study the curriculum guide
( ) teacher meetings to discuss specific parts of the guide
( ) more class time (e.g. two semesters instead of one)
( ) clearer descriptions in the guide
( ) more activities that better suit your students
( ) other: (specify) _____

31. Indicate any of the following that are covered in your TCP class. (check all that apply)

( ) teacher salaries
( ) salaries in other professions
( ) teacher certification requirements
( ) qualifications required for other professions
( ) responsibilities of teachers
( ) benefits of being a teacher
( ) advancement opportunities in the education professions
( ) job market supply and demand for teachers
( ) job market supply and demand for other professions

32. Approximately how many class sessions were devoted to guest speakers from the following sources? (Please indicate number for each.)

( ) University/College
( ) School District
( ) Other: (please provide examples)_____

**TEACHER CADET PROGRAM**
**PRINCIPAL'S SURVEY**

1. Name of School: _____

2. At your school, the Teacher Cadet Program is offered as (check one):

   ( ) a full year course
   ( ) a one semester course (fall only)
   ( ) a one semester course (spring only)
   ( ) a one semester course (both semesters)

3. In your school, TCP students (check one):

   ( ) do not have an opportunity to earn college credit
   ( ) all earn college credit
   ( ) may choose to take the class for college credit or not

4. If TCP students earn college credit, the college fee for credit is:

   ( ) paid by the student
   ( ) paid by the school district
   ( ) shared between student and district
   ( ) other: _____
   ( ) not applicable

5. Name the college or university that is your college partner. _____

6. Who selected the teacher for the Teacher Cadet Program? _____

7. Which of the following criteria influenced the decision for the TCP teacher? (check all that apply)

   ( ) teacher volunteered/teacher interest
   ( ) outstanding teacher
   ( ) availability
   ( ) principal's selection
   ( ) teacher/student rapport
   ( ) other: _____

8. Which *ONE* of the following criteria was *MOST* important? (check only one)

   ( ) teacher volunteered/teacher interest
   ( ) outstanding teacher
   ( ) availability
   ( ) Principal's decision
   ( ) teacher/student rapport
   ( ) other: _____

9. Of the following, who provided the greatest impetus for placing the Teacher Cadet Program at your high school? (check no more than two)

   ( ) Superintendent
   ( ) District Staff
   ( ) Board of Education Members
   ( ) Principal
   ( ) Teachers
   ( ) South Carolina Center for Teacher Recruitment
   ( ) other: _____
   ( ) not applicable

Report your assessment of the items below by circling the appropriate number: (5) Excellent; (4) Good; (3) Average; (2) Needs Improvement; (1) Poor; (0) Don't know .

| | | Excellent | | | | Poor | DK |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10. | Our school's method of recruiting students to the Teacher Cadet Program. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 11. | Our school's method of selecting teachers to teach the Teacher Cadet Program. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 12. | Assistance received from the Teacher Recruitment Center. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 13. | Ability to schedule field experiences during our class meeting time. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 14. | Availability of reading materials, instructional supplies, non-print media. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 15. | Presentations by guest speakers. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 16. | Dependability of the college/university staff. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 17. | Effectiveness of sessions presented by the college/university staff. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 18. | Logistical support provided by the college/university staff . | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 19. | Attitudes of your faculty toward the Cadet Program. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 20. | Cooperation of teachers in *YOUR* building when students observed and/or conducted activities. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 21. | Cooperation of teachers in *OTHER* buildings where students observed and/or conducted activities. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 22. | Cooperation of administrators in other buildings where TCP students were visited. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 23. | Cooperation of district office. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 24. | The success of the Teacher Cadet Program at your high school. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |

25. Would you recommend the Teacher Cadet Program to other principals for implementation at their school?

( ) yes
( ) maybe (explain)
( ) no

(comments) _____
_____

26. In your opinion, the Teacher Cadet Program is an asset for which of the following reasons: (check all that apply)

( ) good public relations for the school
( ) School Board approves of the program
( ) faculty likes the program
( ) parents like the program
( ) teachers like to teach the course
( ) it is an effective tool to recruit future teachers
( ) an excellent class for "bright" students
( ) other:

28. Comments: Please feel free to write general comments about TCP here or on theback of the page

UNIVERSITY LIASON SURVEY - TEACHER CADET PROGRAM

I. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Please provide information or check the appropriate space as requested.

1. Please name your institution: _____

2. Please name your high school "partner(s)":

_____

_____

3. Please indicate whether the students in the program(s) with which you work:

[] do not have the opportunity to earn college credit
[] all earn college credit
[] may choose to take the class for college credit

4. Should college credit be offered to students as an incentive to recruit student to the TCP class?

[] Yes [] No

5. If college credit is available, does your institution:

[] accept the credit as an elective only
[] accept the credit as replacement for another course only
[] apply credit in either of the above cases

II. OVERALL QUALITY OF THE TEACHER CADET PROGRAM

For questions 6-9, please compare the TCP class to typical freshman college courses by circling the appropriate number: 1=below the standards for such courses; 2=less demanding than such courses; 3=about the same as such courses; 4=more demanding than such courses; and 5=clearly above standards.

| | | Below standards | | | | Above standards |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 6. | Course content | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 7. | Degree of initiative/ responsibility on part of students | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 8. | Academic challenge | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 9. | Assignment of grades | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

10. Please indicate (by checking the appropriate space) the degree to which you have reviewed the curriculum materials, "Experiencing Education."

[] have not reviewed the materials
[] cursory review
[] substantive review
[] extensive review

11. On the chart that follows, please rate each unit of "Experiencing Education" according to the following attributes: [1] Quality (the extent to which the materials stimulate interest and actively involve students); [2] Usefulness (the extent to which the materials in the unit were adaptable to the school or teaching); and [3] Appropriateness (the extent to which the materials in the unit were appropriate for introducing students to the field of education). Please use the following 5-point scale. (If you are unfamiliar with a unit, please respond with "0".)

not at all 1 2 3 4 5 excellent

| Unit | Quality 1-5 | Usefulness 1-5 | Appropriateness 1-5 |
|---|---|---|---|
| A. Know Thyself | | | |
| B. "Full Pot" | | | |
| C. Discovering the world | | | |
| D. Making sense of the world | | | |
| E. Barriers to learning | | | |
| F. Confusion about the world | | | |
| G. What is a school? | | | |
| H. Who runs this place? | | | |
| I. Reporting on our roots | | | |
| J. Issues: Seeing both sides | | | |
| K. The Teacher | | | |
| L. The Process of Teaching | | | |

For questions 12-25, please rate the items by circling the appropriate number: [1] unsatisfactory; [2] needs improvement; [3] average; [4] good; and [5] excellent. Please circle 0 for Don't know.

| | Unsatisfactory | | | | Excellent | Don't know |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 12. The school's method of recruiting students to the Teacher Cadet Program | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 0 |
| 13. The school's method of selecting teachers for the Teacher Cadet Program | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 0 |
| 14. Assistance received from the Teacher Recruitment Center | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 0 |
| 15. Ability to schedule field experiences during class meeting time | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 0 |
| 16. Availability of reading materials, instructional supplies, non-print media | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 0 |
| 17. Presentations by other speakers | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 0 |
| 18. Dependability of the classroom teacher | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 0 |
| 19. Effectiveness of sessions presented by the classroom teacher | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 0 |
| 20. Logistical support provided by the school | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 0 |
| 21. Attitudes of your college faculty toward the Cadet program | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 0 |
| 22. Cooperation of teachers in schools where students observed and/or conducted activities | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 0 |
| 23. Cooperation of the principal | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 0 |
| 24. Cooperation of administration in other buildings with which your students were involved | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 0 |
| 25. Cooperation of district office | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 0 |

26. Comments: Please feel free to write general comments about TCP on the back of the page.